

In the claims:

Please amend claims 1 and 8 as shown on the attached sheets.

Please add new claims 27 and 28 as shown on the attached sheets.

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully thank the examiner for his thorough review of the elected claims and the analysis of the prior art.

The discussion of the prior art anticipation rejections will be preceded by a reiteration of the various grounds for each rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-4, and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, lines 3-7, it is unclear. The phrase of "one or more active or passive devices... on the top or bottom surface" is not understood. Does applicant mean "one or more active or passive devices" mounted on a top or bottom, or an edge surfaces?

Regarding claim 8, lines 5-8, it is confuse. Applicant recites "an active or passive device" mounted on an edge surface (lines 5-6), and also, applicant further recites "at least one active or passive device" mounted on a top or a bottom surface (lines 7-8). Does applicant mean "an active or passive device" mounted on an edge surface, and "at least another active or passive device" mounted on a top or a bottom surface?

The rejection of the claims under the second paragraph of 35 USC §112 has now been overcome with the amendment to claims 1 and 8. Accordingly, this rejection can now be withdrawn. It is believed that these two independent claims now successfully overcome the uncertainty concerning the locations of the active or passive devices and the interrelationship of the devices on the planar surfaces with